DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 170 RC 013 262

AUTHOR Kudarauskas, Irene
TITLE Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program. Final Report. Service Improvement Grants National Evaluation.
INSTITUTION White (E.H.) Co., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (DHHS/OHDS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 20 Jan 82
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Reservations; *American Indians; *Child Abuse; *Child Neglect; Child Welfare; *Human Services; *Prevention; Program Costs; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS *Chippewa (Tribe)

ABSTRACT

In 1979 the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect awarded a Service Improvement Grant to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program, one of 29 public and private agencies and organizations, intended to increase the capacity of established service providers involved in preventing or treating child abuse or neglect. Since April of 1979 the project reported 213 families, with 236 children, as beneficiaries of project services. These families included 129 cases of neglect, and 28 cases of other abuse, with 20 cases involving sexual abuse. The project allocated 55.9% of its resources to casework activities, 5.7% to community activities, and 4.5% to services to families. Among direct services, the largest proportions of program resources were devoted to legal (6.3%), therapeutic (2.6%), support and educational (both 1.8%). The active caseload, as of September, 1980 was 47 families. The project reported linkages with 38 public and private agencies and organizations, including child protective service organizations, educational programs, mental health services, the courts, and residential care facilities. The project was terminated in May, 1981, because funds were not available to continue operations. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has since allocated $30,000 to each reservation to implement child protection services. (AUTHOR/ERB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec. 6-04-82

E. H. WHITE & CO.
Management Consultants

ED219170

FINAL REPORT

Minnesota Chippewa Tribe
American Indian
Child Abuse Program

Service Improvement Grants
National Evaluation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert H. Aitken
Human Services Division
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Irene Kudarauskas

20 January 1982

RC 013262

245 Clement Street
San Francisco
California 94118
415/668-0076

1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/783-3294

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the dedicated staff of the Service Improvement Projects, for their cooperation with us and for their dedicated efforts to prevent child maltreatment, and to assist the families who become involved in child abuse or neglect. Most of the community-based projects described in this volume can be considered partial or complete successes, judged by criteria both of service delivery and of success in obtaining continued support. We wish them well, and admire them greatly.

INTRODUCTION

In 1979 the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN), a unit of the Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services, awarded Service Improvement Grants to 29 public and private agencies and organizations. The grants were intended to augment, fill gaps in, or increase the capacity of established service providers involved in preventing or treating child abuse or neglect.

Eight of the 29 awards were two-year grants to legally-mandated child protective service (CPS) units of state or county governments. The remaining 21 grants were three-year, declining-fund awards to private, community-based organizations involved with child welfare. Figure 1 shows the locations of the twenty-nine grantees.

The objective of the National Center in awarding these grants was to augment established systems with new or improved services. The hope was that once the services were developed and implemented, alternate local sources of public and private support could be found, or that savings achieved elsewhere could be redirected.

Concurrent with award of these grants, NCCAN contracted with E.H. White and Company, Inc., a contract research firm, to conduct an evaluation of the services provided under this grant program. Evaluation activities included the establishment of a uniform quarterly reporting system (QRS) to provide quantified information on the 29 projects, and periodic site visits to interview staff and to observe grantee operations. This evaluation began in October, 1979, and extends through March 31, 1982.

In January, 1981, a Final Report was submitted on the Child Protective Service (CPS) projects, whose grant periods had expired the previous October. This document is Volume III of a five-volume final report on the community-based organizations, whose grant periods ended in October of 1981. The volumes of the Final Report include:

Volume I: **Executive Summary,** a volume containing a brief account of the program and the major findings of the evaluation.

Volume II: **Cross-Projects Report,** a quantitative summary, with interpretation, of data collected quarterly from all functioning projects during the entire evaluation. These reports concentrate on service volumes and service costs, staffing patterns, linkages with other agencies, and public awareness activities of the projects.

FIGURE 1: LOCATION OF NCCAN SERVICE IMPROVEMENT GRANTEES

KEY:

1 = Anchorage AK
2 = Birmingham AL
3 = Boise ID
4 = Burlington VT
5 = Cass Lake MN
6 = Columbus OH
7 = Davenport IA
8 = Dayton OH
9 = Delray Beach FL
10 = Denton MD
11 = Eagleville PA
12 = Eugene OR
13 = Greensboro NC
14 = Hanover NH
15 = Helena MT
16 = Honolulu HI
17 = Houston TX
18 = Jonesboro GA
19 = Las Vegas NV
20 = Madison WI
21 = New Bedford MA
22 = Oakland CA
23 = Phoenix AZ
24 = Springfield IL
25 = Tulsa OK
26 = Virginia Beach VA
27 = Wheeling WV
28 = Wilmington DE
29 = Woonsocket RI

Volume III: **Community-Based Organizations Impact Reports,** a set of 22 reports describing for each project its original goals, changes during the grant period, status at the end of the grant period, its apparent impact on the community service system, and the likelihood that the project services will survive the cessation of NCCAN support.

Volume IV: **Program and Policy Questions.** This report provides summary, cross-project answers to general policy questions and to specific policy and procedural questions in fifteen program areas. These questions were developed interactively among contractor, NCCAN, and project staffs as one of the earliest tasks in the evaluation.

Volume V: **Service Improvement Bulletins,** a collection of topical summaries extracted from the first four volumes, and redrafted as seems necessary to make them useful, one-to-two page briefings for mass distribution of evaluation findings.

Since this set of reports represents the capstone of the entire evaluation, findings from the CPS projects were also included where they would contribute, particularly in Volume IV.

More detail on several topics is available in the Special Analyses also produced under this evaluation. Subjects of the special analyses include Sexual Abuse Programs, Parent Education Programs, Screening for Child Abuse and Neglect, Interagency Coordination, Parent Aide Programs, and Peer Support Groups.

This document, Volume III of the series, contains narrative reports for each project not described in the Protective Services Projects Final Report. (One CPS project, the Columbus project, was excluded from the CPS Final Report because it carried over so much of its NCCAN grant into a third year that to have written a final report on it then would have been premature. Its report is included in this volume, along with the twenty-one community-based organizations).

Each profile begins with a brief summary of the quantitative findings. A narrative section follows. It contains sections on the agency background, the original goals of the projects, changes along the way, and the status of the project at the end of the grant period. The appropriate "impact" questions, listed below in Table 1 , are then answered in question-and-answer format. A final section summarizes the project's QRS reports for ten quarters (from March, 1979 to September, 1981).

TABLE 1 : IMPACT QUESTIONS

FOR SERVICES WHICH WILL BE CONTINUED	FOR SERVICES WHICH WILL NOT BE CONTINUED
• What services will be continued?	• What services will be discontinued?
• At what level of funding?	• To what facts or conditions do project workers attribute the termination of services?
• By whom?	• To what facts or conditions do other service providers attribute the termination of services?
• Was the project kept intact, or were services absorbed into other agencies?	• Are project workers still on the job, or are they seeking other positions?
• What, if any, program modifications were or will be made in the process of transferring the service(s) to other sources of funding? Why?	• Is the project still seeking other sources of funding? How optimistic are project personnel of success in this effort?
• Has the project's existence resulted in any lasting structural changes in the local child welfare system?	• Are there likely to be any lasting structural changes in the service system which can be attributed to the existence of the project or service?
	• What will happen to other service providers in the absence of the project or service?
	• What will happen to clients (past, present, and would-be) in the absence of the project or service?

The community-based projects have had more success in integrating their service improvements into the ongoing local system than did the child protective service projects. Most will continue as organizational entities, although some will be making do with smaller budgets. Some will disband, but the services they initiated will continue in some form by related organizations. Those projects whose survival is in jeopardy can show some longterm change or addition which will outlast their organizational existence. Tables 2 and 3 show, for each project, what services will be continued at the previous levels of service delivery, what services will be continued at a reduced level of service delivery, and what services may not outlast NCCAN funding.

TABLE 2

STATUS OF FUNDING AND SERVICES AS OF DECEMBER 1981

	Date NCCAN funds were exhausted	Operating unit to continue beyond NCCAN funding	Some grant services to continue:	By grantee	By other agency	Some grant services discontinued	All grant services discontinued
ANCHORAGE	9/81	yes	yes	x		x	
BIRMINGHAM	9/81	no	yes	x			
BOISE	6/81	yes	yes	x			
BURLINGTON	9/81	yes	yes	x	x	x	
CASS LAKE	5/81	no	yes		x		
COLUMBUS	9/81	no	yes	x	x	x	
DAYTON	9/81	no	yes	x	x	x	
DELRAY BEACH	9/81	yes	yes	x			
EAGLEVILLE	9/81	yes	yes	x			
EUGENE	9/81	no	yes	x	x	x	
GREENSBORO	12/81	no	yes		x	x	
HANOVER	9/81	yes	yes	x	x	x	
HONOLULU	12/81	yes	yes	x	x	x	
HOUSTON	9/81	no	yes	x		x	
LAS VEGAS	12/81	yes	yes	x	x		
MADISON	Varied at the three sites		yes	x		x	
NEW BEDFORD	9/81	yes	yes	x		x	
OAKLAND	9/81	yes	yes	x			
PHOENIX	4/82	no	yes		x		
TULSA	9/81	yes	yes	x	x		
WILMINGTON	9/81	yes	yes	x			
WOONSOCKET	9/81	no	yes	x		x	

TABLE 3

STATUS OF SERVICE DELIVERY
BEYOND NCCAN FUNDING

Project	Services Continued at Previous Level	Services Continued at Reduced Level	Services to be Discontinued
Anchorage		Home Visitors (temporary continuation) Parent Education Peer Support Groups	
Birmingham	Counseling Multidisciplinary Team Professional Education	Interagency Coordination Community Education	
Boise	Family Advocates Parent Education Support Groups Community Education		
Burlington	Interagency Coordination Multidisciplinary Teams Child/Family Advocacy	Paraprofessionals/ Volunteers	
Cass Lake	Case Management Investigation Outreach Services to Families		
Columbus	Parent Education Hotline 24-hour Investigation	Parent Aides Community Education	Emergency Foster Care Emergency Homemakers
Dayton	Professional Education Outreach Investigation Diagnosis Hotline		Coordination of the Multidisciplinary Team
Delray Beach		Counseling Parent Education Crisis Intervention Interagency Coordination (all services only slightly reduced)	
Eagleville	Psychotherapy Counseling Parent Education Crisis Intervention Outreach		
Eugene	Parent Education	Counseling Psychotherapy Homemakers	
Greensboro	Early Intervention Program Therapeutic Aides	Community Education Lead Parent Aides Sexual Abuse Component	
Hanover	Professional Education	Family Advocacy Parent Aides	
Honolulu	Perinatal Screening/ Diagnosis Respite Care Peer Support Groups Information/Referral	Training	Outreach Follow-up
Houston		Counseling	Community Education Development of Bilingual Materials

STATUS OF SERVICE DELIVERY
BEYOND NCCAN FUNDING
(continued)

Project	Services Continued at Previous Level	Services Continued at Reduced Level	Services to be Discontinued
Las Vegas	Parental Stress Helpline Respite Care Emergency Shelter Care Advocacy Self-help Groups for Parents of Handicapped Parents Anonymous	Foster Grandparents Information/Referral	Crisis Response Teams
Madison	Day Care (Milwaukee) 24-hour Respite Care	Day Care (Madison)	Day Care (Racine) Emergency Foster Care
New Bedford		Lay Therapy Services Parent Education Peer Support Groups Wareham Site	
Oakland	Community Education Child/Family Advocacy Counseling Emergency Intake/ Short-term Shelter Care Paraprofessionals Peer Support Groups Services to Children		
Phoenix	Early Identification of High Risk Early Intervention		
Tulsa	Volunteers/ Paraprofessionals High Risk Screening Professional Education Interagency Coordination		
Wilmington	Parent Education Professional Education Community Education		
Woonsocket		Counseling/ Psychotherapy Interagency Coordination	Peer Support Groups Parent Education Advocacy Professional Education Community Education Home-based Early Learning Program Family Advocate

Even those projects whose demise seemed certain have risen, phoenix-like, from their fiscal ashes. The Cass Lake project, which appeared to have ended in April of 1981, was resuscitated in September at a higher-than-former level of funding, with Bureau of Indian Affairs funds. In June, 1981, the Family Advocate Program Board of Directors (Boise project) voted, with great reluctance, to end the program rather than to assume financial obligations which they saw no way of meeting. Two hours later, a groundswell of support from the community and from CPS caseworkers led to a purchase-of-service contract with CPS.

These crises were not merely thrilling episodes in organizational evolution. In both cases, experienced staff were lost due to the uncertainties, and new staff were needed to restore services.

Community-based organizations are private, by definition, and CPS organizations are parts of public bureaucracies. But community-based projects differed from CPS projects in two other important ways, and those other differences prevent our stating with confidence that the type of organization accounts for the differences we found in successful service integration and organizational survival. For one thing, the community-based grants were for three, rather than two, years. The CPS grants provided full funding for two years only; the community-based grants were 100%, then 80%, then 50% of full budget for three years. Projects had more time, therefore, to obtain other support, those who were late in finding it managed to keep alive on the NCCAN monies, even with little or no other support.

Another important difference between the CPS projects and the community-based projects was the "selection ratio" of grantees. There were more than three hundred applicants from community-based organizations; the 21 grants went to the cream of this crop. By contrast, only eleven CPS organizations applied for service improvement grants. The eight applications deemed acceptable all received grants. Therefore, to compare the two groups involves comparing the very best of one group with the larger part of the other.

Because of these confounded differences, we cannot make the policy recommendation that granting agencies should prefer private organizations over local governmental agencies. Such an attitude gives very short shrift to the dedicated, overburdened protective service workers who in the main are dealing with the most serious and heartbreaking cases, and whose responsibilities include court-related activities, foster care, and termination of parental rights. On the basis of these projects' experiences, **we do recommend grants of longer duration than the two year grants awarded the CPS projects.** The application process should also be simplified, in hope of encouraging more applicants. CPS organizations may, ironically, be too taxed by their basic mandated duties to have the spare capacity to prepare lengthy or complicated funding applications.

The community-based organizations described here demonstrated that agencies from the private sector can play an effective role within local child welfare systems in preventing and treating child abuse and

neglect. In specialized functions like early identification (performed by the Dayton, Delray Beach, Hawaii, New Bedford, Phoenix and Tulsa projects) or services to special target groups such as Native Americans or Mexican-Americans (provided by the Anchorage, Cass Lake, Oakland and Houston projects), these grantees delivered services that mandated investigative agencies cannot provide directly, or met the needs of families whose access to public agencies is severely restricted by cultural or language barriers. The successful community-based projects exhibited flexibility, cost-efficiency, and preventive strategies that complemented and supplemented the programs of local protective services agencies.

The large proportion of service components that will operate under reduced post-grant fundings should provoke some concern, since this coincides with a national trend towards reduced public expenditures for family services. Unless voluntary and private agencies expand their efforts in combatting child abuse through programs like those described here, the social and economic cost of child maltreatment is likely to increase. A number of states (in some instances partly as a result of advocacy efforts by these grantees) have developed or are in the process of developing plans for the treatment and prevention of child abuse that explicitly provide a role for private agencies. These plans include both grants and purchase of services arrangements for specialized services, and policies and procedures to facilitate cooperation and coordination of services to families at risk of or involved in maltreatment.

PROJECT IMPACT REPORT

Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program
Minnesota Chippewa Tribe
P.O. Box 217
Cass Lake, Minnesota 56633

PROJECT ABSTRACT

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program received from NCCAN a Service Improvement Grant totalling $290,322 over the 36-month period ending September 30, 1981. The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program serves 30,000 Indian families enrolled in the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. The six member reservations are located in rural northern Minnesota, and cover an area which is over 1,000 square miles.

Since April of 1979 the project reported 213 families, with 236 children, as beneficiaries of project services. These families include 129 cases of neglect, and 28 cases of other abuse, with 20 cases involving sexual abuse.

For the last 30 months of operations, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program reported costs and beneficiaries primarily in the following service categories:

	FAMILIES SERVED	COST PER FAMILY
• Case Management	125	$ 825.13
• Diagnosis	107	131.13
• Investigation	63	218.73
• Outreach	56	52.50
• Foster Care	37	142.83
• Advocacy	34	307.16
• Emergency Shelter	26	6.75
• Information/Referral	22	106.73
• Multidisciplinary Teams	13	847.09
• Legal and Forensic	9	894.23

The project allocated 55.9% of its resources to casework activities, 5.7% to community activities, and 4.5% to services to families. Among direct services, the largest proportions of program resources were devoted to legal (6.3%), therapeutic (2.6%), support and educational (both 1.8%).

The active caseload, as of September, 1980 was 47 families. The project reported linkages with 38 other public and private agencies and organizations, including child protective service organizations, educational programs, mental health services, the courts, and residential care facilities.

The NCCAN project was terminated in May 1981, because funds were not available to continue operations. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, however, has since allocated $30,000 to each reservation to implement child protection services. The Child Abuse Project has already demonstrated a successful model for the individual reservations to follow.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE AMERICAN INDIAN CHILD ABUSE PROGRAM

Cass Lake, Minnesota

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Historical Background*

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is a consortium of the six Chippewa reservations in Northern Minnesota: Leech Lake, Nett Lake, White Earth, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, and Mille Lacs. The Tribe was organized and chartered in 1936 as a result of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, in the first step towards Indian self-government and cultural independence. This historic act reversed the trends of Americanization, Christianization, and assimilation which had all but destroyed the Chippewa culture and life of self-sufficiency.

The Chippewa of the Great Lakes Region are members of the Algonquian linguistic family whose ancestors in that area date back to 800 A.D. The Chippewa were a semi-nomadic people, with a hunting-trapping-fishing-gathering economy. Their society developed according to the rhythm of the seasons, hunting in the forest in the winter, and fishing along the rivers during the summer. Winter meant relative isolation since satisfying elementary wants was the prime consideration. Summer, when fish, crops, and berries were plentiful, was a period when families gathered to participate in communal activities such as tribal rituals and feasts. Due largely to the lack of permanent communities, there was no structured tribal organization. The family was a large connected social network which formed the basis of society. Family ties were defined by clan membership, a blood relationship traced through the mother's line. Private land ownership was unknown; respect for one another's territory and sharing were the prevailing customs.

The Chippewa way of life was initially disrupted by the advent of the French fur traders who provided a market for the Chippewa hunting skills and who, in return, introduced the Chippewa to guns, knives, liquor, cloth, and other manufactured goods. The English settlers and then the American pioneers, who dislocated the Chippewa from their vast territory to establish farm lands and homesteads, altered the Chippewa culture and commenced a new struggle for survival with the U.S. Government.

---

*The historical data in this section is taken from The Chippewas of Lake Superior by Edmund Jefferson Danziger, Jr. (University of Oklahoma Press, 1978) and Section III, Attachment A, of the "Fond du Lac Service Unit Health Plan" prepared by Indian Health Service Staff from material submitted by the Fond du Lac Chippewa Tribe, July 1978.

As a consequence of the LaPointe Treaty of 1854, reservations were established for individual bands. These preserves, however, were too small for the Chippewa to retain their traditional lifestyle and, after years of exposure to the white settler, the Chippewa had become increasingly dependent on traders for food, clothing, and leadership. Attempts at transforming the Chippewa hunters into farmers and lumberjacks were, in the long run, unsuccessful. Education and job training at this time promoted white acculturation.

Beginning in the 1950's, the Bureau of Indian Affairs provided subsidies, training, health care incentives, promises of a higher standard of living, and permanent employment to reservation Indians who agreed to relocate to any of seven urban areas. This new movement was a circuitous attempt to relieve the poverty, inadequate medical care, and substandard housing that prevailed on the reservations. Many Chippewa took advantage of this offer but, after encountering a lack of jobs, prejudice, and poor housing, many returned to the reservations.

The pattern today is variable: some Chippewa live in cities, some live on the reservations, and some leave for an education and return to assume leadership on the reservations. A segment of the population, however, is transient between the two: they live and work in Minneapolis or other cities only to make enough money to return to the reservations. Unemployment rates on the Minnesota reservations range from 40-85% and, with the 1982 fiscal cutbacks almost a certainty, more people may be forced off the reservations to survive. For those who remain, the quality of life has steadily improved, although high rates of alcoholism, cirrhosis, diabetes, teenage suicides, unemployment, accidents, homicides, and a shortened life span remain as testimony to their cultural dislocation.

Another tragic consequence in Indian history has been the systematic separation of Indian children from their families and tribal communities. Surveys conducted in 1969 and 1974 by the Association of American Indian Affairs (AAIA) indicated that approximately 25-35% of all Indian children were separated from their families and were placed in foster homes, adoptive homes, or institutions. This study was the basis for H.R. 12533, the bill which later became the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978. The AAIA found that in Minnesota, one of every eight Indian children under 18 years of age was living in an adoptive home; and, in 1971-72, nearly one in four Indian children under one year of age was adopted. Minnesotan Indian children were placed in foster care or in adoptive homes at a per capita rate five times greater than non-Indian children. According to state figures, more than 90% of nonrelated adoptions of Indian children were made by non-Indian couples. The grounds for removal for the majority of these cases were neglect, social deprivation, and emotional damage; only a fraction of children were removed due to physical abuse. Ignorance of Indian cultural values and social norms, and a misunderstanding of the dynamics of Indian extended families is currently acknowledged as the underlying cause for these actions.

The passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act in November 1978 returned the supervision of Indian families to the tribes. The Act

recognizes the authority of tribal courts; mandates that every attempt shall be made to keep families together, and when a child is removed, the Act mandates that she/he will be placed with members of the extended family, tribe, or other Indians. It also requires that the child's tribe is notified of all court activities, to insure that any action taken is in the best interest of that child. Money to implement these regulations, however, has been awaited since 1978.

B. Agency Background

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is the administrative organization for the six Chippewa bands in northern Minnesota. The Tribe is governed by the Tribal Executive Committee which is formed by two delegates, the Chairman and the Secretary/Treasurer, who are elected from each reservation. This twelve-member board elects the President of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. The Tribe exercises central governing powers over interband matters and contracts for the administration of programs previously handled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs within the State of Minnesota.

Each member reservation has a Reservation Business Committee composed of the Chairman, the Secretary/Treasurer, and up to three elected district representatives. The six Reservation Business Committees operate programs and provide services on each of the individual reservations. The reservations, through the Reservation Business Committees, operate as states and are subject to the powers and responsibilities held by the Tribal Executive Committee, the administrative staff, and various programs. The Reservation Business Committees each hire an Executive Director to supervise daily operations.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is responsible for human services to approximately 30,000 Indian people on the six member reservations. The Tribe currently operates a multitude of programs: foster care services, day care centers, alternative schools, chemical dependency programs, law enforcement programs, and health care programs. Prior to 1974, however, there were no reservation-based or tribal-operated social services available. In 1974, the Tribe contracted monies from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for social services under the Bi-Indian Act of 1921. A part-time social service representative was hired in 1975 and by 1976, that position was full-time and a Director of Social Services was in place. The Director's primary responsibility was - and is - planning and developing social services for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. In 1981, the Social Service Committee merged with the Health Committee to form the Human Services Committee, which supervises the operations of eleven varied programs.

Projects that were initiated under the Director of Social Services include the American Indian Foster Care Project (1976-1978), which was directed at permanency planning for children in foster care; Supportive Services to American Indian Youth (1977-1980), which developed volunteers for a Big Brother/Big Sister program and Volunteers in Probation; a boys group home (1978 to present); and the Child Welfare

THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE RESERVATIONS

Project (1978-1981), which surveyed the needs of the reservations, provided direct services to families, and prepared a comprehensive social service plan for the Division. Also in 1978, the Tribe received a Service Improvement Grant from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect to develop a program to identify, treat, and provide education in the area of child abuse and neglect. The intent of the Tribe has been to provide model programs utilizing Indian professionals and paraprofessionals which could subsequently be implemented and maintained by each reservation.

II. SERVICES INTRODUCED OR IMPROVED AS A RESULT OF THE NCCAN GRANT

The fourteen county welfare agencies encompassed by the six reservations have small staffs, large caseloads, and a considerable geographic area to cover. Racism and cultural stereotyping are still evident and, actually, some old territorial disputes were revived with the passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act. Some counties were reluctant to give up their authority to the Tribe, or were skeptical of the capability of Indian workers. The Indian clientele, because of Native American values, lifestyles, and family network systems, historically had been reluctant to report, identify, or refer child abuse or neglect cases to these non-Indian county welfare agencies. Until the NCCAN-funded child abuse project, however, there was no alternative.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Project, in addition to providing services to families, was intended to provide a model identification and treatment program to the reservations and the counties, and to act as liaisons for the coordination of Indian-based resources and county services. New services that were provided as a result of the Service Improvement Grant included:

- Direct services such as investigation, diagnosis, counseling, information, referrals, and advocacy provided by Indian workers to reservation Indian families who were considered to be at risk of child maltreatment or in families where child abuse or neglect had occurred;

- Coordination of services and consultation on individual cases to county agencies; and

- Community education to each reservation on the identification, treatment and prevention of child abuse and neglect.

To implement these services, a staff of five professional and paraprofessional workers were hired. The project director, supervisor, and one child protection worker were based at the Tribal headquarters in Cass Lake on the Leech Lake Reservation; the other child protection workers were based at the White Earth and Fond du Lac Reservations. The original staff included a child protection worker for the Nett Lake Reservation who was also based at Cass Lake.

III. CHANGES, MODIFICATIONS

During the two and one-half year course of the project, no changes were made in the original objectives. Modifications occurred in the delivery of services to each of the six reservations; the extent of the implementation of project services varied from one county to another.

For example, one child protection worker was assigned to cover both the Grand Portage and Fond du Lac Reservations. Originally located at Duluth to serve both of these areas, this worker was later moved to the Fond du Lac Reservation and focused most of her efforts in that area. Likewise, one worker had been assigned to the Nett Lake Reservation from a Leech Lake Reservation base. This part-time effort proved unwieldy for the worker and the reservation clients as well. The Nett Lake staff preferred to hire a worker from within the reservation but first wanted to hire a Social Service Coordinator, who would in turn hire a child protection worker. The coordinator's position remained vacant since no suitable person could be found and, by default, the project position was also vacant. Since the project's funds were limited, the Tribal administration opted to use the unexpended money from that position to keep the remaining four project workers operating for a longer period of time. The Mille Lacs Reservation received part-time services also, by the project supervisor.

In Cass County, the project workers were empowered by the county welfare department to investigate cases of child abuse and neglect. While they reported all findings to the mandated child protective services unit, they often were the sole provider of services. In other counties, project workers did not take on the investigative role of the county workers but often accompanied county workers, at their request, on difficult cases. It had once been hoped that each county would reach an agreement similar to that in Cass County; but this did not occur, in part, because counties were unwilling to delegate their authority and in part because the project workers were already inundated with cases without the additional responsibility of case investigation.

Other than these changes, the project services were successfully carried out as they had been planned.

IV. STATUS AT THE END OF GRANT PERIOD

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Project terminated both the project services and project workers on May 22, 1981. Community support had been secured for one position, a Child Protection Worker on the Leech Lake Reservation, which was funded by the Cass County Department of Social Services. Other county agencies were either unable to provide funding because of their own fiscal cutbacks, or were unwilling to provide monies because they felt that the county workers could adequately handle cases involving American Indian families.

Although the project itself has ended, each reservation has developed or is in the process of developing social service systems based on the Child Abuse Project's model. Proposals for funding were

submitted to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to implement the regulations of the Indian Child Welfare Act.

In August 1981, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe was notifed that each reservation will receive an allocation of $30,000 for social services at the start of the next fiscal year. This money will provide 1-1/2 social workers for each reservation, almost double the NCCAN project staff. Because of the lapse in time between the end of the NCCAN grant and the start of the BIA monies, however, the Tribe was fiscally unable to retain the project personnel on staff.

V. PROGRAM IMPACT QUESTIONS

Q. What services will be discontinued?

A. All project services were discontinued as of May 22, 1981, although it was hoped that this situation would be temporary.

Q. To what facts or conditions do project workers attribute the termination of services?

A. The project was terminated because of the lack of community support funding. No additional funding had been secured to match the declining federal grant for the second or third year; the project had operated totally on NCCAN funds.

Q. To what facts or conditions do other service providers attribute the termination of services?

A. The national conservative fiscal trend affected the county welfare agencies who might otherwise have provided funding for the project. Anticipating their own diminishing revenues, they were unable to allot money to another agency even though they would have liked to do so. Other county agencies, however, did not regard the use of Indian workers on the reservations as a priority. Some counties have a small Indian population and had minimal contact with project workers; some counties felt that the Indians did not require "special" services.

Q. Are project workers still on the job, or are they seeking other positions?

A. All of the project workers were terminated as of May 22, 1981. The child protection worker at White Earth had planned to continue her activities on a voluntary basis; money has now been made available to pay her. The other project workers anticipated a period of unemployment before moving on to new endeavors. The project supervisor was seeking other employment, off the reservation if necessary; one child protection worker was planning to return to school to complete her bachelor's degree in social work; and the fourth child protection worker had decided to leave the field of social work. Each staff member expressed the need for a respite from their current duties. One of the two Leech Lake staff applied for the position available in that area.

Q. Is the project still seeking other sources of funding? How optimistic are project personnel of success in this effort?

A. Each reservation has incorporated a child protection worker into their plans for individual social service systems as a result of the project's model and were pursuing sources of funding. Reservation officials were optimistic that funding would be forthcoming from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to enact the regulations of the Indian Child Welfare Act. Money was being sought from other sources as well.

Q. Are there likely to be any lasting structural changes in the service system which can be attributed to the existence of the project or service?

A. Two major objectives of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe are closer at hand due to the existence of the Child Abuse Project and the earlier mentioned Child Welfare and Foster Care Projects. These projects demonstrated to the reservations and the counties that Indian workers were valuable and effective in providing services to reservation families. The county welfare agents who worked with project staff had come to rely on their expertise in dealing with families. Clients were more inclined to discuss family problems with the project staff who would, in turn, coordinate services with the county staff on behalf of these clients.

As has been stated previously in this report, the success of these projects has also demonstrated a model social service system which can now be implemented by the individual reservations. One reservation official stated that they were ahead of their plan for services as a result of the relationship that had been established by the child protection worker and the county welfare staff.

Q. What will happen to other service providers in the absence of the project or services?

A. County workers expected to see an increase in families from the reservations in their caseloads. Reservation-based service providers expected to assume some limited duties of the project staff. At White Earth, for example, families in acute crisis could be seen by the mental health worker.

Q. What will happen to clients (past, present, and would-be) in the absence of the project or service?

A. The most frequent response of clients to the project workers at termination was "What are we supposed to do?" Clients had come to rely on the project staff; in their absence, the county welfare agencies would once again become the major source of services, until the reservations can assume that responsibility.

VI. PROGRAM OPERATIONS

A. Beneficiaries [Report 4]

During the thirty months from April 1979 through September 1981, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program provided services to 213 families, including 236 children. Of these families, 129 (60.6%) were classified as neglect cases and 28 (13.2%) were classified as abuse, while one (0.5%) was at risk. Twenty families (9.3%) were involved in sexual abuse. The active caseload was about 89 families, so that for the thirty months described here, approximately 2 families occupied each "slot" in the program capacity.

B. Costs [Report 2]

For the thirty months described here, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program reported total expenditures of $297,600. Of these expenditures, 55.9% went to casework activities, 5.7% to community activities, and 4.5% to services to families. Among direct services, the largest expenditures went to legal (6.3%), therapeutic (2.6%), and shelter (2%). Indirect costs accounted for 31.9% of program resources, rising from 18.3% in June 1980 to 28.3% in March 1981.

The project was above the median in its proportion of expenditures for program and casework activities.

C. Specific Services [Report 1]

The largest costs were attributed by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program to the following specific services:

SERVICE	COST	PERCENTAGE
Case Management	$103,531	34.8
Staff Training	59,080	19.9
Diagnosis	14,050	4.7
Investigation	13,749	4.6
Interagency Coordination	11,718	3.9
Multidisciplinary Teams	10,835	3.6
Advocacy	10,443	3.5
Legal and Forensic	8,170	2.7
Foster Care	5,307	1.8
Paraprofessional Counseling	5,032	1.7
Research and Evaluation	4,876	1.6
Other Family Services	4,454	1.5

The services that were provided to the largest number of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program clients were:

SERVICE	FAMILIES SERVED	% OF TOTAL CASELOAD
Case Management	125	59%
Diagnosis	107	50%
Investigation	63	30%
Outreach	56	26%
Foster Care	37	17%
Advocacy	34	16%
Emergency Shelter	26	12%
Information/Referral	22	10%
Multidisciplinary Teams	13	6%
Legal and Forensic	9	4%
Paraprofessional Counseling	7	3%
Professional Counseling	4	2%

The cost per family was below the median for the twenty-two grantees for:

Emergency Shelter	$ 6.75	vs.	$ 76.82
Foster Care	142.83	vs.	302.51

D. Unit Costs [Report 3]

For the thirty months reported here, the average actual cost was $1400.00 per family and $1260.11 per child, figures obtained by dividing overall actual cost by the number of families or children. When the imputed value of donated services is added, the adjusted costs are $1400.00 per family and $1260.11 per child. If only client services are considered (that is, excluding costs attributed to overhead and community services), the actual direct costs averaged $873.22 per family and $785.97 per child.

E. Coordination [Report 5]

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program reported a total of 50 relationships with 38 different agencies and organizations. These included child protective services organizations, educational programs, mental health services, the courts, and residential care programs.

The most frequent types of coordinating relationships were accepting referrals (21), making referrals (21), and lending staff to the project (3).

F. Staffing

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe American Indian Child Abuse Program had a staff of 5 permanent workers, of whom one worked halftime or less. Four of the five staff were women. The project replaced 4 workers prior to the end of the 36-month grant period.